



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/823,754	04/14/2004	Pao Chin Chang	MR1957-873	5070
4586 7590 09/25/2007 ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE 3458 ELLICOTT CENTER DRIVE-SUITE 101 ELLICOTT CITY, MD 21043			EXAMINER ROBERTS, JESSICA M	
			ART UNIT 2621	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/25/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/823,754

Applicant(s)

CHANG, PAO CHIN

Examiner

Jessica Roberts

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding claim 5, the word polyimide is misspelled and bakelite should be capitalized.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Paff et al., US-4,833,564.

4. Regarding claim 1, Paff teaches a speed dome (fig. 3), comprising: a monitor module used to shoot nearby scenes (camera; fig. 1B: 14); a plurality of position-controlling devices used to control a horizontal angle and a vertical angle of the monitor module (Paff discloses a circuit board develops the control signals for the lens assembly and the pan and tilt motors. It communicates with these components via respective connectors; column 6 line 29-41. Further the examiner notes that the combination of the circuit board, pan and tilt connectors and the motors provide a position controlling device); and a plurality of bracing plates used to brace the monitor module (Paff

Art Unit: 2621

discloses plates, 5, 7 and 7b and 7b'; column 3 line 41-47, column 4 line 1-10), the bracing plates having a circuit disposed thereon (Paff, printed circuit control board 42 supported on the plate 7; column 6 line 29-31), wherein the circuit is used to drive the monitor module and the position-controlling devices, and the bracing plates are circuit printed boards (PCBs).

5. Regarding claim 2, Paff teaches wherein the monitor module is a charge-coupled device (CCD)(column 5 line 64-67 to column 6 line 1-4).

6. Regarding claim 3, Paff teaches wherein the position-controlling devices further comprise two motors respectively used for controlling the horizontal angle and the vertical angle (Paff, pan and tilt motors; column 6 line 32-34 and fig. 1A: 11 and 19. The examiner notes that by controlling the pan and tilt of the camera would provide controlling the vertical (tilt) and horizontal (pan) angles made from the camera position).

7. Regarding claim 5, Paff teaches wherein the bracing plates are made of bakelite, pottery, paper-based material, metal, polyester, polyimide or thermoplastic material (Paff discloses the plate 5 is metal; column 3 line 40-42).

8. Regarding claim 6, Paff teaches wherein the circuit comprises a camera control unit and a position control unit (Paff discloses where the data control develops the control signals for the lens assembly 13 and the pan and tilt motors 11 and 19; column 6 line 30-37. Further the examiner notes that the combination of the circuit board, pan and tilt connectors and the motors provide a position controlling device. Further disclosed by Paff is that the configuration allows the lens assembly and pan and tilt motors to be

Art Unit: 2621

controlled so as to effect panning and tilting of the field of view of the assembly column
6 line 49-49).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 4, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paff.

11. Regarding claim 4, Paff is silent with respect to wherein the bracing plates are made of fiberglass. However, Paff does disclose the plates are made from metal. It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to use the well know material of fiberglass with a structural support. As evidence by Cheng et al., US-5,386,626 where a fiberglass reinforcing plate is disclosed; see abstract.

Conclusion

12. The referenced citations made in the rejection(s) above are intended to exemplify areas in the prior art document(s) in which the examiner believed are the most relevant to the claimed subject matter. However, it is incumbent upon the applicant to analyze the prior art document(s) in its/their entirety since other areas of the document(s) may be relied upon at a later time to substantiate examiner's rationale of record. A prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention. W.L. Gore & associates, Inc. v. Garlock,

Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984).

However, "the prior art's mere disclosure of more than one alternative does not constitute a teaching away from any of these alternatives because such disclosure does not criticize, discredit, or otherwise discourage the solution claimed...." In re Fulton, 391 F.3d 1195, 1201, 73 USPQ2d 1141, 1146 (Fed. Cir. 2004).

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Paolantonio et al., US-6, 913,403 B2 – Integrated enclosure and controller for video surveillance camera.

Coutta et al., US-7,337,482 A – Surveillance system.

Duncan et al., US-6,215,597 B1 – Apparatus for forming a plurality of subimages having different characteristics.

Zantos et al., US-6,476,856 B1 – Orbit camera housing.

Stiepel et al., US-5,394,209 A – Surveillance device with eyeball assembly and pivotably mountable carriage assembly.

Coutta et al., US-4,326,218 A – Surveillance system.

Gota et al., US-5,560,174 A – Connector.

Sergeant et al., US—5,627,616 – Surveillance camera system.

Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jessica Roberts whose telephone number is (571) 270-

Art Unit: 2621

1821. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00 EST Monday-Friday, Alt Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on (571) 272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jessica M. Roberts/
09-12-2007

Mehrdad Dastouri
MEHRDAD DASTOURI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TC 2600